



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/270,780	03/17/1999	IKUO HIYAMA	503.36984X00	2934

20457 7590 04/16/2002

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

QI, ZHI QIANG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/270,780	HIYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mike Qi	2871	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8,10,12-15,17-18,20-22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 9,11,16 and 19 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 2871

DETAILED ACTION

1. The preliminary amendment and the substitute specification of June 22, 1999 have been entered.
2. The corrected form PTO-892 wherein “Yunki et al” should be “Yuuki et al” presented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4, recitation “the polarized light transmission axis is arranged approximately perpendicularly to a light control axis of the light control element” is indefinite and unclear as a light control axis of the light control element in which the axis can not be a control axis. For examination purpose, it is interpreted as the polarized light transmission axis is arranged approximately perpendicularly to the optical axis of the light control element.

Claim 12 does not indicate any specific arrangement for the reflective polarizing selective layer, the absorption type polarizing selective layer and the reflective color selective layer, and how to achieve the broaden viewing angle, e.g., a stripe direction of reflective color selective layer is the same as a stripe direction of stripe shaped rod lens array, etc. The claimed language

Art Unit: 2871

only states a list of elements are arranged, but it does not describe the specific arrangement how to achieve the effect of the widen viewing angle.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-7, 10, 13-14, 17-18, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant admitted prior art in view of US 5,587,816 (Gunjima et al).

Claims 1, 13 and 20, the Applicant admitted prior art (the “background of the invention” paragraph in the specification, especially in Figs. 32 and 35) discloses a structure of a liquid crystal display device comprising:

(concerning claim 1)

- an illumination device (51,53,54);
- a light control element (40) arranged at a projected light side of the illumination device;

Art Unit: 2871

- a reflective polarizer (30) arranged at an upper portion of the light control element (40), so that the transmission axis of polarized light is adjusted so as to increase the transmission rate of the projected light from the illumination device (51,53,54);
(concerning claims 13 and 20)
- a liquid crystal display element (20) for controlling polarization of projected light projected from the reflective polarizer (30), so that the major axis direction of a pixel is arranged approximately in parallel with a direction wherein the linearly polarized light component of the projected light projected from the illumination device (51,53,54) is high;
- a screen (10AA) arranged at an upper portion of the liquid crystal display element (see Fig.32).

Applicant admitted prior art also discloses (page 5, lines 5-6) that the viewing angle is widened by the screen (10AA).

Although the Applicant admitted prior art does not expressly disclose the effect of the polarizer to adjust the transmission axis and increase the transmission rate, but that is the polarizer's function.

Gunjima discloses (col.5, lines 30-41) that the polarizing sheet provided on the light-incident side of the liquid crystal display element, such that the transmittance thereof is maximized with respect to the p polarized light component which is emitted from the polarized light separator.

Art Unit: 2871

Gunjima also discloses (col.3, lines 11-15 and col.2, lines 27-31) that the s polarized light component is reflected and is reused.

Therefore, the transmission axis of polarized light is adjusted and the transmission rate of the projected light from the illumination device is increased.

Gunjima also indicates (col.5, lines 36-41) that an average direction of an optical axis of polarization of a light ray emitted from the flat light guide in the flat illumination device approximately agrees with the optical axis of polarization of the polarizing sheet on the light-incident side of the liquid crystal display element, i.e., the polarized light transmission axis of the reflective polarizer is approximately in parallel with a major axis direction of pixel of the liquid crystal display element (because the p polarized light is transmitted), so as to obtain a maximized transmittance.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange such reflective polarizer as claimed in claims 1, 13 and 20 for achieving maximum light transmittance and widen the viewing angle.

Claims 2-3, Gunjima discloses (col.5, lines 30-41) that the polarizing sheet provided on the light-incident side of the liquid crystal display element, such that the transmittance thereof is maximized with respect to the p polarized light component which is emitted from the polarized light separator.

Gunjima also discloses (col.3, lines 11-15 and col.2, lines 27-31) that the s polarized light component is reflected and is reused.

Art Unit: 2871

Gunjima also indicates (col.5, lines 36-41) that an average direction of an optical axis of polarization of a light ray emitted from the flat light guide in the flat illumination device approximately agrees with the optical axis of polarization of the polarizing sheet on the light-incident side of the liquid crystal display element, i.e., the polarized light transmission axis of the reflective polarizer is approximately in parallel with a major axis direction of pixel of the liquid crystal display element (because the p polarized light is transmitted), so as to obtain a maximized transmittance.

Concerning claim 3, the optical axis of the s polarized light component is perpendicular to the optical axis of the p polarized light component, and the minor axis direction of the pixel also is perpendicular to the major axis direction of the pixel, so that the polarizer having the directivity of the light in a minor axis direction of the pixel.

Applicant admitted prior art also discloses (page 5, lines 5-6) that the viewing angle is widened by the screen (10AA), so that is the screen broaden the projected light in the minor direction of the pixel.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange such polarizer as claimed in claims 2-3 for achieving maximized transmittance and widen the viewing angle.

Claim 4, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (Fig. 36) that the reflective polarizer (30) in which the polarized light transmission axis (31) is arranged approximately perpendicularly to the optical axis (41) of the light control element (40).

Art Unit: 2871

Claim 5, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (page 4, lines 23-25 and Fig.32) that a screen (10AA) has transparent portions in the shape of quadrangular pyramid at the displaying plane side and black absorbing bodies covering the intervals therebetween, i.e., a screen composed to absorb external light (because the black absorbing bodies) and to transmit projected light from the illumination device (because the transparent portions).

Claims 6 and 14, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (page 6, lines 10-20 and Fig.35) that in the light control element (40), generally, PET (polyethylene terephthalate) film having a birefringence material is used. So that the PET film is a birefringent medium, and that is arranged between the illumination device (51,53,54) and the light control element (40).

Claims 7, 18 and 22, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (page 4, lines 18-22) that the liquid crystal layer (13) is interposed between two transparent substrates (11A, 11B) and two polarizers are arranged on either side thereof.

Gunjima discloses (col.17, lines 36-67 and Fig.1) that a liquid crystal display element using a pair of absorbing type organic polarizing plates (9 and 10), so as to increase the contrast ratio.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use a pair of absorption type polarizers as claimed in claims 7,18 and 22 for increasing the contrast ratio.

Art Unit: 2871

Claims 10 and 17, normally, the reflective color selective layer corresponding to the pixel of the liquid crystal element as shown in the Applicant admitted prior art Fig. 37 to display the color image.

7. Claims 8, 15 and 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant admitted prior art and Gunjima as applied to claims 1-7, 10-14, 17-18, 20 and 22 above, and further in view of US 6,147,725 (Yuuki et al).

Claims 8, 15 and 21, Yuuki discloses (col.2, lines 19-54 and Fig.13) that a illumination device comprises:

- a flat shaped waveguide (light guide 206);
- a light source (lamp 201) arranged adjacently to the waveguide (206);
- a reflector (reflecting sheet 207) with a plurality of sawtoothed diffused reflection parts (208a-208d), i.e., the reflector composed of numerous protruded planes, each of which have slightly declined planes, at a rear plane of the waveguide (206), and also at the rear plane of the illumination device as claimed in claim 21;
- the projected light from the light source (201) is propagated in the waveguide (206) and projected from the light projecting plane of the waveguide (206).

Although Yuuki does not expressly disclose the declined plane of the reflector are manufactured to be mirrors, but using mirror plane for reflecting light was common and known in the art.

Art Unit: 2871

Yuuki also indicate (col.2, lines 50-54) that this reflection light is repeatedly carried out in the light guide plate (206), whereby the amount of light passing the polarizing separating film (205) is increased, thereby decreasing loss of the lamp light.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange such illumination device as claimed in claims 8, 15 and 21 for increasing the amount of light passing the polarizer and decreasing the light leakage.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 9, 11, 16 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art of record neither teaches nor discloses a liquid crystal display device comprises various elements as claimed, more specifically, as the following:

the light control element is any of a isotropic medium and a uniaxial birefringent medium [claims 9 and 16];

an angle range θ_1 , wherein the brightness becomes $\frac{1}{2}$ of the peak from the illumination device satisfies: $\theta_1 \leq \sin^{-1}(n \sin(\tan^{-1}(2d/t)))$ wherein t is thickness of substrate, n is refractive index of substrate, d is length of minor side of pixel of the liquid crystal display element [claims 11 and 19].

Art Unit: 2871

The closest references Applicant admitted prior art and the US 5,587,816(Gunjima et al) disclose that a LCD device using illumination device and polarized light separating sheet between a light guide and the display in which reusing the light to increase the brightness, but it does not show the light control element is isotropic medium or uniaxial birefringent medium and the specific relation of the angle range with the substrate thickness and the length of the minor side of the pixel.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on Feb.25,2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's only arguments are as follows:

- 1) Claims 4 and 12 are not unclear.
- 2) The references (including Applicant admitted prior art) do not disclose all of the features of the claims 1, 13 and 20.

Examiner's responses to Applicant's only arguments are as follows:

1) Claim 4, recitation "the polarized light transmission axis is arranged approximately perpendicularly to a light control axis of the light control element" is indefinite and unclear as a light control axis of the light control element in which the axis can not be a control axis.

Claim 12, the claimed language only states a list of elements are arranged, but it does not describe the specific arrangement how to achieve the effect of the widen viewing angle.

Art Unit: 2871

2) The references (including the Applicant admitted prior art) disclosed limitations written in the claims as the explanation above.

Especially, Applicant admitted prior art discloses (page 5, lines 5-6) that the viewing angle is widened by the screen (10AA). Gunjima discloses (col.5, lines 30-41) that the polarizing sheet provided on the light-incident side of the liquid crystal display element, such that the transmittance thereof is maximized with respect to the p polarized light component which is emitted from the polarized light separator. Gunjima also discloses (col.3, lines 11-15 and col.2, lines 27-31) that the s polarized light component is reflected and is reused.

Therefore, the transmission axis of polarized light is adjusted and the transmission rate of the projected light from the illumination device is increased.

Gunjima also indicates (col.5, lines 36-41) that an average direction of an optical axis of polarization of a light ray emitted from the flat light guide in the flat illumination device approximately agrees with the optical axis of polarization of the polarizing sheet on the light-incident side of the liquid crystal display element, i.e., the polarized light transmission axis of the reflective polarizer is approximately in parallel with a major axis direction of pixel of the liquid crystal display element (because the p polarized light is transmitted), so as to obtain a maximized transmittance.

Art Unit: 2871

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (703)308-6213 .

Mike Qi
April 3, 2002

Mark
TOANTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER